REMARKS

The Final Office Action of April 8, 2011 has been received and carefully reviewed. By the above amendment, claims 1-9 and 33-35 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and new claims 36-55 have been added, whereby favorable consideration of the pending claims 36-55 is respectfully requested. In the Office Action, the claims were rejected as obvious based on citations of various combinations of Chiba 7,187,459 with Whale 2002/0188504, Kimura 6,226,097 and Chapman 7,466,442, and in further combination with Engstrom 6,463,078.

Pending claims 36-55 are directed to electroreprographic devices and embedded systems thereof. Independent claim 36 and its dependent claims 37-45 provide an electroreprographic device with an I/O terminal (IOT), one or more device-specific provider APIs, and an embedded system. Independent claim 46 and its dependent claims 47-55 are directed to an embedded system of an electroreprographic device.

New independent claims 36 and 46 recite that the embedded system includes a device model agent stored within nonvolatile memory of the electroreprographic device. The cited references, alone or in the proposed combinations of the Office Action, fail to teach or suggest such an embedded system. Rather, Chiba discloses storing a printer control crap program in nonvolatile ROM on a host computer, and then storing computer programs within the RAM, and volatile ROM within the printer. In this regard, the citation to Chiba figure 10, and column 10, lines 34-49 specifically says that the ROM 1034 stores programs for communication control, and visualization of the printer, etc. in advance *in a volatile manner*. Thus, the electroreprographic device of claims 36-45, and embedded systems of claims 46-55 are patentably distinct from the proposed combinations of these references, whereby favorable consideration of these new claims is respectfully requested for at least this reason.

The DMA of new independent claims 36 and 46 represents the electroreprographic device to a remote services host and to a remote asset management system. The control program storage area 16 and Fig. 1 of Chiba is not the claimed device model agent, and this program storage area does not represent Chiba's printer 10 to a remote services host or to a remote asset management system as claimed. For this further reason, therefore, the new independent claims 36 and 46 are patentably distinct from the proposed combinations of Chiba with Whale, Kimura and Chapman, and favorable consideration of the new claims 36-55 is therefore respectfully requested.

The DMA of the new independent claims, moreover, is operative to communicate the electroreprographic device status, configuration, and offered services to the remote services host and to the remote asset management system using a common transaction language. This further aspect is not found in Chiba, Chapman or the other applied references, whereby the new claims 36-55 are further patentably distinct from the proposed combinations.

Independent claims 36 and 46 further provide that the DMA provides a services environment that is a runtime environment for the services on the electroreprographic device to provide device-independence for the services offered by the remote services host. This further aspect of the new claims is neither taught nor suggested by the above references, whereby favorable consideration of the new claims 36-55 is respectfully requested for this further reason.

The DMA of the independent claims further operates to dynamically provision the electroreprographic device to automatically download software as needed to add, delete, update, and customize the services offered by the electroreprographic device, which are determined by the remote services host and remote asset management system. These further elements of independent claims 36 and 46 are neither disclosed nor suggested by the combinations of the above references proposed in the Office Action. For this further reason, therefore, favorable consideration of new claims 36-55 is respectfully requested.

New dependent claims 37 and 47 recite further details of the DMA, including a DMA core with a common information model (CIM) API, a common information model object manager (CIMOM), and a service manager, as well as a common provider API that communicates with one or more device-specific provider APIs to retrieve information about the electroreprographic device configuration, status, and/or supply levels, and makes the retrieved information available to the CIMOM, the service manager, and to the services running on the services environment. The proposed combinations set forth in the Office Action fail to teach or otherwise suggest these further features of new claims 37 and 47, whereby favorable consideration of these claims and their dependent claims 38 and 48 is respectfully requested.

New claims 38 and 48 depend respectively from claims 37 and 47, and additionally provide that the DMA resides between a device-specific API and a services layer that includes a collection of running services. These claims further recite that the DMA is connected to a communications medium to communicate directly with the remote services host and with the remote asset management system. These further limitations of claims 38 and 48 are neither taught nor suggested by the above references, and for these further reasons, favorable consideration of new claims 38 and 48 is respectfully requested.

New claims 39-42 and 49-52 depend respectively from independent claims 36 and 46, and further provide feature similar to cancel claims 2-5, whereby favorable consideration of these new dependent claims is also respectfully requested.

New claims 43 and 53 further provide that the DMA selectively invokes a diagnostic routine on the electroreprographic device in response to active, dynamic monitoring of the occurrence of an electroreprographic device event of interest as directed by internal or external clients or users. This further DMA aspect of claim 43 and 53 is neither taught nor suggested by the proposed combinations of the above

references. In particular, Whale does not disclose diagnostic activity, whereby favorable consideration of these claims is respectfully requested.

New dependent claims 44 and 54 further provide that device status indicates device conditions, including availability of communication between the DMA and the IOT of the electroreprographic device. This is neither taught nor suggested by Whale or the other cited references, whereby favorable consideration of claims 44 and 54 is respectfully requested.

New claims 45 and 55 depend from independent claims 36 and 46, and further recite that the DMA includes an applications/services execution/runtime environment residing between a Java runtime environment (JRE) and an embedded server. The proposed combinations set forth in the Office Action either teach or suggest this further feature of claims 45 and 55, and applicants accordingly request favorable considerations of these claims.

CONCLUSION

For at least the above reasons, reconsideration of the currently pending claims is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone interview would be helpful to facilitate favorable prosecution of the above-identified application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

If any extensions of time are required and/or if any fees are due as a result of the filing of this response, any such extensions of time are hereby requested and the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any such fees to the Deposit Account Number 24-0037, XERZ201277.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY SHARPE LLP

/Eric Highman/
Eric Highman
Reg. No. 43,672
The Halle Building, 5th Floor
1228 Euclid Ave
Cleveland, Ohio 44115
216-363-9000